

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OFF PAGES
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. PR-HQ-01-12990/0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 06/20/01	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. PR-HQ-01-12990	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY Environmental Protection Agency Bid and Proposal Room, Ariel Rios Building (3802R) 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20460		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6)	CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street county, State and ZIP Code)			(✓)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. PR-HQ-01-12990
			✓	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06/06/01
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE			

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [] is extended, ☒ is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)**13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.**

(✓)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [] is not, [] is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible)

The purpose of the amendment is to incorporate in Section M the clauses identifying evaluation for award requirements for the Conflict Of Interest Plan and the Quality Management Plan.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) CASSANDRA L. MILLER	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
PREVIOUS EDITION UNSALE

30-105

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 52.243

AMENDMENTS TO THE SOLICITATION

1. The Section M clause entitled "EVALUATION OF COI PLAN" has been added. The text is as follows:

The Plan described in the Section L Provision entitled "Conflict of Interest Plan," will be evaluated as acceptable or not acceptable. Notwithstanding the evaluation of an offeror's technical proposal and cost proposal, an offeror which submits a plan that is ultimately determined unacceptable will not be eligible for award of a contract resulting from this solicitation. Exchanges of information with offerors about the acceptability of their Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan shall not constitute discussions under FAR 52.215-1(a).

2. The Section M clause entitled "EVALUATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN)" has been added. The text is as follows:

The plan described in the Section L provision entitled "Quality Assurance Management Plan," is a responsibility factor and will be evaluated as acceptable or not acceptable. Notwithstanding any other evaluation of the offeror's proposal, an offeror that submits a plan that is ultimately determined unacceptable will not be eligible for award. Exchanges of information with offerors about the acceptability of their "Quality Assurance Management Plan (Quality Management Plan)," shall not constitute discussions under FAR 52.215-1(a).

3. The attachment entitled "EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD" has been modified. The text is as follows:

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (EPAAR 1552.215-71)(AUG 1999)

- a) The Government will award the contract to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to the solicitation, best demonstrates an understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract, and has a reasonable cost/price. For this solicitation demonstrated understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract (as demonstrated by responses to sample task, project/contract quality, past performance, and capacity to perform) is significantly more important than cost or price. As proposals become more equal technically based on demonstrated understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract, the evaluated cost or price becomes more important. Please note that in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f)(4), the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contract without discussions with offerors. Therefore, the offerors initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a technical and cost or price standpoint.
- b) Evaluation factors and significant subfactors to determine quality of product or service:

The evaluation factors shall be evaluated on a point score basis. The following evaluation criteria Sample Task, Project/Contract Quality, Past Performance and Personnel Qualifications will be subject to the point scoring as set forth in the “*point summary*” listed below. The evaluation of the Quality Management Plan and the **Conflict of Interest Plan** will be on a “*acceptable/unacceptable*” basis.

POINT SUMMARY

CRITERIA	WEIGHT
Sample Task	35 Points
Project/Contract Quality	25 Points
Past Performance	25 Points
Personnel Qualifications	15 Points
Total	100 Points

The following Technical Evaluation Criteria are listed in descending order of importance:

Technical criteria for evaluating the oral presentation:

1. Sample Task. 35 POINTS

To what extent does the offeror demonstrate skill in preparing a comprehensive and sound plan for addressing the elements set forth in the CWPPRA Technical Assistance sample task. The following major elements are considered with equal importance in the evaluation of this criterion.

- a. Overall Understanding of the Task. The offeror demonstrates a complete understanding of the task and the capabilities necessary for its successful completion.
- b. Technical/Management Approach. The offeror demonstrates an efficient technical/management approach and utilization of appropriate resources.
- c. Assumptions. The assumptions made in the development of the response to the task are discussed and are logical and relevant.

2. Project/Contract Quality. 25 POINTS

To what extent does the offeror demonstrate that it has the technical capability/experience to perform all areas of the solicitation. The following major elements are considered in descending order of importance with A being greater, and B and C of equal importance

- a. Knowledge and Experience. The offeror demonstrates a high-level of knowledge and experience with the work set forth in the solicitation.
- b. Scientific Methodologies. The offeror demonstrates knowledge and experience with the use of scientific analysis methodologies (including water, biological, and cultural resources) for evaluation of environmental resources.
- c. Quality Assurance and Quality Control. The offeror demonstrates an understanding of and the ability to address and ensure the quality control and quality assurance of the activities performed.

Technical criteria for evaluating the written proposal(s):

3. Past Performance.

25 POINTS

The offeror must demonstrate that it has the technical capability to execute the solicitation requirements based on past performance. The offeror must demonstrate a track record of quality past performance on existing and prior contracts that are similar in scope, size, type, and complexity to this requirement. The following major elements are considered with equal importance in the evaluation of this criterion.

- a. Quality of service/supplies. The overall quality of deliverable goods and services provided. Adherence to the quality control measures. The level of quality remained consistent over time.
- b. Timeliness of performance. Goods and services were delivered in accordance with the delivery schedule. For any goods or services that did not comply with the delivery schedule, the contractor offered temporary alternatives or accommodations.
- c. Effectiveness of management. Multiple tasks or work assignments were handled efficiently without confusion. Subcontractors were used effectively. The contractor provided good, clear progress reports on a regular basis.
- d. Meeting requirements. Initiative was taken to meet all contract requirements in a timely manner.
- e. Responsiveness to technical direction. The contractor immediately responded to all technical direction. The contractor provided timely notification of technical direction considered outside of the scope of the contract.
- f. Responsiveness to performance problems. Performance problems were promptly remedied. Problems that could possibly jeopardize the success of the requirement

- were brought to the attention of the Contracting Officer/program personnel.
- g. Compliance with cost estimates. No unwarranted cost overruns or unauthorized expenditures were experienced. Actual costs were consistent with the contractor's cost estimates.
 - h. Customer satisfaction. All clients were satisfied with the contractor's performance.
 - i. Overall performance. The contractor met all terms and conditions of the contract. Performance was efficient.

4. **Personnel Qualifications.**

15 POINTS

To what extent does the proposal demonstrate competency of personnel at both the team and individual levels. The following major elements are considered with equal importance in the evaluation of this criterion.

- a. Team. The offeror's proposed team is complete, well organized, and efficient. The personnel are appropriately matched to the work elements of the solicitation. The lines of authority within the organization and the interface points with EPA are clearly defined.
- b. Individual. Contractor personnel are qualified to execute the requirements of the solicitation to which they are responsible. The resumes are clear and concise and describe the individual's academic background and work history.

5. **Quality Management Plan (QMP).**

The evaluation of the QMP will consist of determining to what extent the offeror demonstrates a high level of capability for and commitment to Quality Assurance and Quality Control. The QMP will not receive a point score rating. It will be evaluated to determine whether it is acceptable or unacceptable prior to award of the contract. An offeror that submits a plan that is ultimately determined unacceptable will not be eligible for a contract award. Exchanges of information with offerors regarding the acceptability of their QMP shall not constitute discussions under FAR 52.215-1(a).

The offeror must demonstrate that adequate procedures are in place to ensure that performance conforms to specific requirements of the contract and work assignment(s). The QMP shall demonstrate the offerors understanding of management and organization (include the identification of roles and responsibilities), quality system, and description, personnel qualifications and training, procurement of items and services, documentation and records, computer hardware and software, planning implementation or work processes, analysis and

response and quality improvement.

6. Conflict of Interest Plan

The plan described in Section L, entitled “Conflict of Interest Plan,” will be evaluated as either acceptable or not acceptable. Notwithstanding the evaluation of an offeror with respect to the technical evaluation criteria or the evaluation of an offeror's cost, an offeror that submits a plan that ultimately is unacceptable at the time of the award will not be eligible for a contract award. Exchanges of information with offerors regarding the acceptability of their Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan shall not constitute discussions under FAR 52.215-1(a).